INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS
OFFICE OF SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

Belle Gunness, the Lady Bluebeard: Community Legend as Metaphor
Author(s): Janet Langlois
Source: *Journal of the Folklore Institute*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (May - Aug., 1978), pp. 147-160
Published by: Indiana University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3814091
Accessed: 10/06/2014 08:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Indiana University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Folklore Institute.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

BELLE GUNNESS, THE LADY BLUEBEARD: COMMUNITY LEGEND AS METAPHOR

Janet Langlois

James Peacock's imperative to see narrative as structuring society can be applied to the interrelation of American society and its narratives of violence.

> Heed the power of narrative to structure and distill patterns underlying all phases of social process. View entire social processes as structured around and distilled by narrative form. In short: treat society as narrative.[1]

In *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier,* Richard Slotkin points to the peculiar manifestation of the American success dream in narratives about the hunter-hero who violates and transcends social norms in the boundary spaces of the frontier.[2] Stewart Holbrook also comments on "that misty, unmapped half-world" of narrative that "Americans have made and lovingly preserve for certain of their folk villains" in *Murder Out Yonder: An Informal Study of Certain Classic Crimes in Back-Country America.*[3] Despite Slotkin's and Holbrook's studies, Richard Dorson is still able to write in his article "Defining the American Folk Legend," that "murder is one of the complex events in community life most apt to generate local traditions . . . but folk legends of murders have not been assembled or much investigated."[4]

In order to test the structuring power of narrative hypothesis in the American milieu, I have selected for analysis a community legend about a woman who committed a series of murders at the turn of the century in a

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

northwest Indiana town. In summary, Belle Gunness was a Norwegian immigrant who settled on a farm just outside the city limits of LaPorte, Indiana, during the fall of 1901. From that time until 1908, she apparently murdered a husband, several women, children, and numerous would-be suitors who had answered her matrimonial ads. She dismembered her victims, poured quicklime over them, put them in gunny sacks, and buried them in her pigpen.

On the morning of 28 April 1908, the Gunness farmhouse burned down. In the aftermath of the fire, townspeople discovered the victims' bodies and the body of a decapitated woman which was officially determined to be Belle Gunness' but which was unofficially believed to be a decoy set by the escaped murderess. The situation was ambiguous for LaPorte residents on several levels. First, the actual events—the murders, the fire, and the fate of the murderess—were known only through circumstantial and inconclusive evidence. Second, the motivations for the murderess to act and for the community to have allowed such acts to go unnoticed were unknown. Within this undefined context, narrative traditions have been maintained within the community for seventy years which I suggest have defined or structured social relationships within the town.[5]

Good Fences Make Good Neighbors

The narrator in Robert Frost's poem "Mending Wall" cannot explain why he and his neighbor continue to repair the dry-stone fence between their properties when

> He is all pine and I am apple orchard.
> My apple trees will never get across
> And eat the cones under his pines, I tell him.

His neighbor's habitual response—the proverb "Good fences make good neighbors"—provokes him to ask, "*Why* do they make good neighbors? Isn't it/ Where there are cows?"[6]

Pine and apple trees actually do figure in LaPorte residents' evaluative statements about the "Lady Bluebeard's" relations with her neighbors. One resident told an interviewer in 1967 how to get to the Gunness property: "You'll see a row of trees. You see, she didn't want people to see what she did. She shielded it with a row of pine trees."[7] Another summed up the relationship: "She never associated. The kids never stole her

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

apples!"[8] The Gunness trees are not neutral—they function as signs of Belle Gunness' secretiveness and alienation.

But, for the Gunness neighbors, the incident of the cows epitomizes her unneighborliness. Dora R., 78 at the time of our interview on 22 September 1975, recalled:

> Well, I tell you this woman kept you away from her. She was very hard to get along with. She had a farm and all the fences she'd let go so her cattle would go in your field. Well, you know, that causes hard feelings. And *no* one was a friend of hers . . . . And she'd *always* keep you kinda so you didn't want to have nothing to do with her. *All* the neighbors, not just us.

The specific incident between Belle and Dora R.'s father, William D., however, is the event that has entered narrative tradition. Another neighbor, Albert N., gave this version in July 1952:

William D. had corn right across road [from us]. She [Belle] had two heifer calves.	*Setting*
He had fixed up fence, she'd tear fence down again. Let them in. Had no feed for them.	*Preliminary interaction*
Finally he drove them into his barn and sent a kid up to notify her.	*Protagonist's action*$_1$
She came down.	*Antagonist's action*$_2$
He demanded pay, stood in front of barn door and said she had to pay damages.	*Pa*$_2$
She pulled out a butcher knife: "Damn you, you get away from that door or I'll kill you right there!"	*Aa*$_2$

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

This was in the fall [probably of 1903 or 1904].	*Setting*
William D. was afraid of her.	*Gloss/metacriticism*

George H., 77 at the time of our interview on 10 April 1976, William D.'s nephew, remembered his uncle telling the story somewhat differently.

Well, his cows got out first	*Preliminary action*
She drove them into her yard and locked them up. Took out a .45 revolver and said, "You can't have them until you pay fifty dollars for damages."	*Episode*$_1$: Aa_1 Aa_2
And there wasn't even any damages.	*Gloss*
Then *her* cows got out	*Preliminary action*
and he took them in and wouldn't let *her* have them until she paid fifty dollars!	*Episode*$_2$: Pa_1 Pa_2
. . . He sure made her pay it back!	*Gloss*

A comparison of Albert N.'s gloss (William D. was afraid of her.") with George H.'s ("He sure made her pay it back!") suggests that variation in these narratives may be a function of the kinship system. George H., as a relative, recalled William D.'s ascendency by expressing the interaction between the neighbors in two parallel episodes which outline the reciprocal nature of their exchange, its "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" quality. Albert N., a nonrelative, recalled William D.'s fear. His version of the neighbors' interaction is condensed and monoepisodic, culminating in Belle's overreaction which warranted her neighbor's justifiable qualms.

An analysis of the accounts of the incident given by William D.'s daughter, Dora R., indicates that an explanation for narrative variation is somewhat more complex than a kin/non-kin opposition. Her 22 September 1975 account:

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

You'd go down and you'd tell her: "Now, either fix your fences or pay for your cattle or shut them up." Which we finally did	*Preliminary interaction*
One time my father locked them in the barnyard	$Episode_1$ Pa_1
and she come down and we had a padlock on the gate and she said, "I want my cattle."	Aa_1
And he said, "Well, if you give me a dollar then you can have them."	Pa_2
So, she sent this hired girl, Jennie . . . . She says, "Jennie, go home and get a dollar.". . . And she come down with the dollar and she handed it to him	Aa_2
and he took off the padlock and he—and the chain—and he said, "This ought to be around your neck up in that tree!"	Pa_3
And, you know, he hated her that bad.	*Gloss*
So, then, she watched. We used to have to watch the cows along the road, you know, let them eat along the road to pasture. And we were coming home from school one night. We seen they were out there and when they got to her house,	$Episode_2$
she opened the gate and run them all in.	Aa_1

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

So she says to my father, "Now, when you give me a dollar, you can have them!"	Aa_2
And my Dad said, "But you run them in here off the road!"	Pa_1
She said, "I don't care."	Aa_3
My Dad was going to unhook the gate	Pa_2 *attempted*
and she says to this Jennie, she says "Jennie, go in and get the revolver." And the girl did.	As_4
And so he had to pay her a dollar!	Pa_3
That's the kind of neighbor she was.	*Gloss*

In the preceding narrative the neighbors' interaction occurs in non-reciprocal, reverse parallel episodes similar to George H.'s version. The trespass of William D.'s cows on the Gunness property is a function of Belle's overreaction and not of William's neglect. Her attempt at "getting even" creates an imbalance in the interaction. The injustice is literally and metaphorically on her side of the fence. The structure of the narrative reflects an imbalance intrinsic to injustice shown in the attempted but not completed action of the protagonist. William D. is not afraid of Belle, but neither is he an equal partner in the feuding. Belle overstepped the boundaries of civility and he could not follow, being a civil man, although he did go so far as to verbally wish her hanging from his apple tree.

At our 26 March 1976 interview, Dora R. repeated "the story of the cows." This version emphasized Belle's overreaction, bringing the narrative close to Albert N.'s in tone. When William D. attempted to open the Gunness gate to herd his cattle out, Belle "hit him with a horsewhip and says, 'Don't touch the gate,' " before calling for her foster daughter, Jennie, to bring the gun. Belle's actions appeared so unwarranted that Ronnie R., fifteen, Dora R.'s grandson, asked "Was she serious?" Ronnie who heard his grandmother tell the story several times, gave me two *alternative* accounts of the incident:

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

The cow went over into his pasture. Ya. In Grandpa D.'s pasture.	*Episode* *Preliminary action*
So he put a lock and chain on the gate.	Pa_1
And she wouldn't, didn't want to pay to get the cow back so she said to one of her daughters to go get the gun.	Aa_1
She had a pistol I guess it was. In the house. The daughter started to go away and	
he said, "Stop. I'll let you have them for free!"	Pa_2
'Cause he knew that she really would have got, gotten the gun out 'cause they weren't too good of friends. She [Dora R.] said that they were really enemies.	*Gloss*
And, then, a while after that, *his* cow got over there so he had to pay to get it out!	$Episode_2$ Pa_1
. . . It might have been that his went in there first and then he had to pay to get it back.	*Alternate episode* Pa_1
And then it [Gunness cow] went over in his and she wouldn't pay to get it back.	Aa_1
Or something like that. I can't remember.	

I suggest that Ronnie R.'s uncertainty about how the story happened is

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

not simply a function of memory failure but an indication of the structuring power of narrative. Ronnie's story, in comparison with the other testimonies originating from William D.'s proto-testimony, incorporate all the possibilities of the event and so moves from history as irreversible time to mythic structure as reversible time. Whose cows initiated the action, which was antecedent and which was consequent act, is not as important as the statement of the relationship between the neighbors: " 'Cause they weren't too good of friends."

The family saga of the cows is a model for talking about the abstract relation, "neighbor." The message of what constitutes a *good* neighbor in a community which values the private property of the homestead is coded in the testimonies of Belle's broken fences and wandering cows. Neighbors using the narrative model of the cows to communicate Belle's unneighborliness have "loosened" the model from the event itself. Ronnie R.'s "reversible" narrative is an example. Albert N.'s account, told in 1952, of his family's altercation with Belle concerning her broken fences and wandering pigs, indicates an application of the model to an experience similarly perceived. His narrative of Belle's pigs causing property damage, structurally similar to the cow story, has a similar message about neighborliness: "She had a sow and pigs, let them out. They'd get into the corn . . . . Pa, he began to cuss."[9]

Jake and Susie J., a LaPorte couple in their early thirties whom I interviewed on 19 May 1976, decoded the message:

> JJ: I detest pigs.
> SJ: Hog barn the foulest smell in the world.
> JJ: The philosophy around here is you want to get rid of your neighbors, you raise hogs.

When Jake said that "feuds are still going on around here" because of deteriorating fences and stray livestock, his statement approximated the ultimate abstraction of knowledge from particular events and its application to any culturally appropriate situation: the proverb "Good fences make good neighbors." The stories of the cows and pigs are, therefore, extended proverbs.

Belle Gunness' campaign of alienation was so effective that neither William D. nor Swan N. (Albert N.'s father) went to her home that Tuesday morning of 28 April 1908 to help douse the fire. Dora R. remembered:

> The morning that the house burnt was the last day of school, the 28th of April, and we always had a picnic.

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

> And, 'course, my mother woke up and was going—'course, they didn't have a bathroom then, at that time they had an outside toilet. She woke up and she looked out the window and she said to my Dad, "Looks like a fire up at the old lady's."
>
> And he said, "Aw, c'mon to bed. She's probably got the house insured good and's going to burn it up now."
>
> And he wouldn't even get up and look. (22 September 1975)

Albert N. remembered:

> When the fire started, Mother, a light sleeper, woke in the morning, getting daylight, asked, "How come the sun is coming up this side of the house?"
>
> Ma and John wanted to go up, but Pa says, "You stay away, she's mad at us, you could get the blame for starting it." (1952)[7]

The two structurally congruent accounts are also models of Belle Gunness' disintegrative power. Under other circumstances, these two would have joined other farmers in harvesting crops, in raising barns, or putting out fires—the way among country neighbors. They would have heeded their wives' first impulses to provide aid. As it was, Belle Gunness' abuse of a neighbor's rights caused a corresponding atrophy of her neighbors' obligations. The rules for the social relationships within the neighborhood had been broken with the fences. The narratives are vehicles for this dysfunction. They order chaos (1) by defining the relation "neighbor," (2) by foreshadowing Gunness' greatest asocial acts, her murders, and (3) by justifying townspeoples' ignorance of their neighbor's activities.

The Sausage Story

Henry J., 89 at the time of our interview on 3 May 1976, recalled walking into the buggy shed on the Gunness farm and seeing the disinterred bodies laid out on wooden planks during the first week of May 1908: "And I was completely covered with human meat. I bet there was twenty, twenty-five bodies on there." Glenn O., 81 at the time of our interview on 29 April 1976, referred to a photograph of the bodies in the shed and said, "And here's some of the meat they dug up! Hamburger!" Both men, eyewitnesses to the Gunness horror, compared Belle's muti-

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

lated victims to chopped meat. Residents of LaPorte, predominantly those who are under thirty, have elaborated this vivid metaphor into a complex of narratives about Belle making men into sausage or feeding them piecemeal to her hogs. Both traditions exist in a dialectic of belief within the community. Fred H., at our 8 April 1976 interview, stated positively that Belle's shed, now on his property, had been "the original slaughter place where she had murdered her victims and fed them to the hogs, the pigs." Randy H., 19 at the time of his interview in 1967, stated positively that he disliked Belle's hamburgers. He gave a case history, an urban belief tale, to support his claim: "A lady was sitting in the restaurant eatin' one day. She bit in and found her husband's ring in a hamburger. He had been missing for about three months. They found a lot of skeletons too [in the meat she sold]."[10]

Other residents interviewed were not so certain of Belle's activities. Raymond C. qualified his statements about "the Queen of the Abattoir": "She had a slaughterhouse at the farm which undoubtedly helped in her disposing of the 42 victims she had supposedly cut up and buried about the farm. It has been said that she fed the flesh to her hogs."[11] Jerry S., a LaPorte High School senior at the time of our interview on 6 May 1976, had heard the story from a friend in Wisconsin "really pulled out of proportion." The friend had told him about a woman who had lived in Indiana and had killed 30 men, not knowing Jerry was from LaPorte. Jerry told me, "I just let him go on, because he said she'd killed 'em and fed 'em to the hogs. Well, partly that is true. She did feed parts to the hogs."

Experts on the Gunness case, Maxine F. and Martin B. discredit the traditions. Max responded to my 3 April 1976 question about the sausage stories by saying:

> Oh, that. I really don't believe the sausage stories but she *did* raise hogs . . . . And she did sell sausage. To a lot of people in LaPorte! Of course, immediately then it was found out that it was a murder farm and there was a butcher and a lock-up, a stand-up locker in the basement of the home, the sausage market dropped! I really don't believe that!

Three weeks later, Martin responded by giving a plausible explanation for the story:

> That's not true. She used lye. She didn't make sausage out of people. I can tell you how that story got started. She had a big

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

tub or vat made out of a trunk of a tree. She used that to dismember bodies to handle more easily although she was a big strong woman. Two hundred and fifty pound person. She could wrestle with a man.

The legend dialectic emerges most clearly in an argument recorded between husband and wife, Jake and Susie J., quoted earlier.

JJ: Exaggerate about the pigs, sausage stuff.
SJ: Since I was little, I heard she ground them up and fed them to hogs, sold it. Don't know whether or not they had hamburger then or not. Sold it and fed it to the pigs.
JJ: All exaggeration.
SJ: John [their son] heard at school she made hamburger.
JJ: . . . There's been other events like Belle Gunness. Other murders. Why do you think they keep bringing up Gunness?
SJ: Because it's a woman . . . . In those days, women just didn't murder people, chop up people, and feed them to the hogs, murder—
JJ: She didn't do all that . . . . Each generation exaggerates. Probably like a fish story. Gets bigger . . . . If you've been raised on a farm all your life (shrugs shoulders).

Although Jake discounted Susie's belief in the sausage stories they both heard as children in LaPorte, he understood what the stories were saying.

JJ: You know, it's just like people . . . . It's like some mothers have a baby and throw it in the garbage can. You've read that in the newspaper. Good mothers, bad mothers. Some hogs care for litter, some don't. We're an animal, aren't we?

People more intelligent but—you watch animals. When I watch cars driving on the Loop [in Chicago], I think of cows in the field. And you know about sheep. You get one through the gate and the whole rest of the herd will follow. People are the same way.

Jake's thoughtful association of human and animal characteristics indicates an analogy such as

Gunness victims: other men:: slaughtered hogs: other animals

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Such an analogy is perceived whether or not the traditions themselves are believed, questioned, or dismissed as "hogwash" by individual LaPorte residents. The sausage narratives outline Gunness' power to created social anomie. By transforming her victims into swine, the murderess deprived them of their social identity. Buried in pieces in the hog lot, possibly eaten by pigs and sold as sausage, they were nameless and unidentifiable. The elaboration of their number in narrative (e.g. 10, 13, 25, 30, and 42) indicated that they were, in fact, numberless.

By transforming her victims into swine, the murderess deprived them of their specific social identity as suitable husbands as well. The pejorative sense of labeling a man a swine in relation to his ineligibility as a marriage partner is developed by Edmund Leach in his article on animal categories and verbal abuse and is concretely dramatized in the sausage stories.[12]

Belle Gunness' sausagemaking as a metaphorical statement of her dissolution of the marriage structure is strengthened by comparision with other variants of "The Bloody Miller" tale. In summary, a husband characteristically butchers his wife or wives, smokes the meat and sells his human sausage in stories from the Ozarks, Mississippi, Michigan's Upper Peninsula, and Wisconsin. Perhaps the most famous sausage mill belongs to "Mister Dunderbeck" or "Johnny Verbeck" who is appropriately ground up in his own mill and fed to the hogs as punishment.[13] In the sausage stories, Belle Gunness becomes the feminine counterpart of the bloody miller. The rules for distinguishing man from animal and for defining appropriate procedures in courtship and marriage have been dissolved. The narratives are vehicles for this dysfunction. They mediate chaos (1) by defining the relation "marriage," (2) by foregrounding Belle Gunness as "the mail-order Circe," and (3) by locating the "raison d'être" of the murders in the stupidity of the victims who answered her matrimonial ads.

Legend as Metaphor

"The power of narrative to structure and distill patterns underlying all phases of social process" is the power of metaphor.[14] James Fernandez defines the use of metaphor in expressive culture as "the prediction of a sign-image upon an inchoate subject" in his 1974 *Current Anthropology* article.[15] Fernandez defines a "sign-image" as "an item or token of communication" which has "felt but unconceptualized meanings."[16] Such a "sign-image" modifies the "inchoate" or unknown subject in such a way that the subject is identified and placed within an evaluative framework. I suggest that the narratives of Belle's wandering cows and pigs and of

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

her sausagemaking are "sign-images." They communicate to their tellers and audiences in the LaPorte community a method for defining and evaluating the relationship sets of neighbor and of marriage which would otherwise remain unelaborated. This perception of narrative power lies in Robert Georges' comment at the end of his presentation at the 1969 UCLA symposium on American folk legend: ". . . legends appear to be metaphorizations of basic kinds of relationship sets . . . incapable of being tested empirically to the satisfaction of every man."[17] In this sense, narratives of violence can truly be regenerative of American social structure.

Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

NOTES

[1] James Peacock, "Society as Narrative," in *Forms of Symbolic Action; Proceedings of the 1969 Annual Spring Meeting,* ed. Robert F. Spencer (Seattle: University of Washington Press for the American Ethnological Society, 1969), pp. 167-177.

[2] Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1973).

[3] Stewart Holbrook, *Murder Out Yonder: An Informal Study of Certain Classic Crimes in Back-Country America* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), p. 240.

[4] Richard M. Dorson, "Defining the American Folk Legend," in *American Folklore and the Historian* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), p. 170.

[5] Sources for LaPorte community traditions on Belle Gunness are legal, popular, and oral. The LaPorte County Historical Society Museum staff are thanked for their help in locating legal documents and popular novels. The LaPorte County and Public Library staff are thanked for the use of the microfilm collection of town newspapers of the period. The oral material comes from three sources: (1) unpublished transcripts of interviews done in July and August of 1952 by author Lillian de La Torre for her book *The Truth About Belle Gunness* (New York: Fawcett Gold Medal, 1955), (2) unpublished transcripts of interviews, 1967-1975, housed in the Indiana University Folklore Archives, conducted by students in introductory folklore classes, and (3) my own field research conducted from August 1975 to June 1976.

[6] Robert Frost, "Mending Wall," in *The Poetry of Robert Frost,* ed.

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Edward Connery Latham (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969), pp. 33-34. Originally published in *North of Boston* (London: David Nutt, 1914).

[7] Indiana University Folkore Archives, 68/42. Madeline K. to Janice Mellenthin, 31 December 1967.

[8] Indiana University Folklore Archives, 68/42. Gene M. to Janice Mellenthin, 31 December 1967.

[9] Albert N. to Lillian de La Torre, July 1952.

[10] Indiana University Folklore Archives, 68/42. Randy H. to Janice Mellenthin, 31 December 1967.

[11] Indiana University Folklore Archives. Legend File, IU:3903. Raymond C. to Donna Terry, 26 July 1974.

[12] Edmund Leach, "Anthropological Aspects of Language: Animal Categories and Verbal Abuse," in *New Directions in the Study of Language,* ed. Eric H. Lenneberg (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1964), pp. 23-63.

[13] Richard M. Dorson, *American Folklore* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), pp. 98-99.

[14] Peacock, "Society as Narrative," pp. 167-177.

[15] James Fernandez, "The Mission of Metaphor in Expressive Culture," *Current Anthropology* 15 (1974): 119-133.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Robert A. Georges, "The General Concept of Legend: Some Assumptions to be Reexamined and Reassessed," in *American Folk Legend: A Symposium,* ed. Wayland D. Hand (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), p. 18.

This content downloaded from 188.72.127.77 on Tue, 10 Jun 2014 08:08:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions